

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 7-14 are withdrawn from consideration. The Office Action dated September 29, 2006 in this Application has been carefully considered. The above amendments and the following remarks are presented in a sincere attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. Claims 1, 15 and 20 are amended in this Response. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,970,924 by Chu et al (“Chu”). In light of the amendments submitted herewith, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 1 as now amended more particularly recites several of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, namely:

“receiving an IP address *by a user equipment upon authentication within a visited serving network*;

performing a reverse domain name query *by the user equipment* as a function of the received IP address;

receiving, *by the user equipment*, a response *from the visited serving network* to the reverse domain name query;

deriving, *by the user equipment*, serving network domain name information from the reverse domain name query;

appending, by the user equipment, the derived serving network domain name information to an application server name;

performing, *by the user equipment*, a domain name query as a function of the derived serving network domain name *appended to the application server name*; and

receiving, *by the user equipment*, an IP address as a function of the derived serving network domain name *appended to the application server name*.” (Emphasis added.)

Support for this Amendment can be found, among other places, on page 4, lines 28-29, page 5, lines 20-21, and page 6, lines 10-30 of the Application as originally filed.

Amended Claim 1 recites a process by which a visiting user equipment (UE), such as a mobile station (MS) 103, discovers the IP address of an application server in the visited network. The UE or MS presumes to know a portion of the URI name of the application server it seeks to find, based upon standardized names as described on page 5, lines 20-21 in the Application as originally filed. The UE or MS has been assigned an IP address, which is a number, and desires to discover the IP address of the application server. To accomplish this, the UE or MS performs a reverse DNS query to discover a URI name, which is a character string, assigned to itself or to a corresponding application gateway. Within this URI name is the name of the network and top-level domain. The UE or MS then distinguishes the network-domain name from its own name, and appends the network-domain name to a presumed, standardized name of the desired application server. The UE or MS can then perform a DNS query to discover the IP address, which is again a number, assigned to the desired application server. This process is described on page 6, lines 10-30, and on page 7, line 1 through page 8, line 13 of the Application as originally filed.

Regarding Claim 1, Chu was cited as assertedly disclosing the process recited in Claim 1 as originally filed. In particular, Chu was cited at col. 16, lines 7-32, as disclosing a process whereby serving network domain name information is derived from a reverse domain name query, and an application server name is prefaced to the derived serving network domain name information. More particularly, the passages ‘a router with links named "host1.inverse.net" and "host2.alter.net" may be situated on the administrative boundary between "inverse.net" and "alter.net"' and ‘A central server, such as the server at whois.internic.net, can be queried for the owner of a given IP address. Whois requests return domain names, administrative contacts and company names. These can be

used to determine the entity responsible for the IP address' assertedly refer to the claimed process. However, this passage of Chu teaches a method for determining boundaries between different domains for the purpose of determining 'which domains contribute which amount of delay and the responsibilities for delays among various routers can be accumulated to the service provider responsible for the router.' The stated purpose of a reverse DNS lookup (query) in Chu is to 'determine the entity responsible for the [a given] IP address.' There is no suggestion in Chu of appending a discovered network domain name to a presumed, standardized application server name as described in the present application.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited reference does not disclose, teach or suggest the unique combination now recited in amended Claim 1. Applicants therefore submit that amended Claim 1 is clearly and precisely distinguishable over the cited reference in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over this reference and the remaining references of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of amended Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Chu be withdrawn and that Claim 1 be allowed.

Claims 2-3 depend on and further limit Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these Claims would be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of the dependent Claims 2-3 also be withdrawn.

Claims 4-6 and 15-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Chu, in view of Official Notice. Independent Claim 15 further stands rejected for the reasons stated above for the rejection of Claim 1.

Claims 4-6 depend on and further limit Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these Claims would be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of the dependent Claims 4-6 also be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 15 as now amended more particularly recites some of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, namely:

“request an IP address *for the UE* from the visited network;
receive the requested IP address associated with the UE;
perform a reverse domain name query as a function of the received IP address;
receive a response to the reverse domain name query;
derive domain name information from the reverse domain name query;
append the derived domain name information to a standardized application server name,
thereby generating a domain-specific application server name;
perform a domain name query as a function of the domain-specific application server name;
and
receive an IP address as a function of the domain-specific application server name.”

(Emphasis added.)

Support for this Amendment can be found, among other places, on page 4, lines 28-29, page 5, lines 20-21, and page 6, lines 10-30 of the Application as originally filed.

Amended Claim 15 recites a system comprising a visiting user equipment (UE), such as a mobile station (MS) 103, configured to discover the IP address of an application server in the visited network. The visiting user equipment performs the process as discussed above with respect to Claim 1. This process is described on page 6, lines 10-30, and on page 7, line 1 through page 8, line 13 of the Application as originally filed.

Regarding Claim 15, Chu was cited as assertedly disclosing the process recited in Claim 1 as originally filed, and incorporated into the rejection of Claim 15. As discussed above with respect to Claim 1, there is no teaching, disclosure or suggestion in Chu of appending a discovered network

domain name to a presumed, standardized application server name as described in the present application.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited reference does not disclose, teach or suggest the unique combination now recited in amended Claim 15. Applicants therefore submit that amended Claim 15 is clearly and precisely distinguishable over the cited reference in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over this reference and the remaining references of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of amended Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Chu be withdrawn and that Claim 15 be allowed.

Claims 16-19 depend on and further limit Claim 15. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these Claims would be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of the dependent Claims 16-19 also be withdrawn.

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite. More particularly, Claim 20 is rejected as being unclear as to the limitation attempted to place on the logic to extract a domain name from the reverse DNS query. Claim 20 as now amended more particularly recites the system of Claim 15 *further comprising* logic to extract a domain name from the reverse DNS query. (Emphasis added).

Claim 20 depends on and further limits Claim 15. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, this Claim would be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of the dependent Claim 20 also be withdrawn.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1-6 and 15-20.

Applicant does not believe that any fees are due; however, in the event that any fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-0605 of CARR LLP.

Should the Examiner deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CARR LLP

Dated: December 21, 2006
CARR LLP
670 Founders Square
900 Jackson Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
Telephone: (214) 760-3030
Fax: (214) 760-3003

/Gregory W. Carr/
Gregory W. Carr
Reg. No. 31,093